

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 60-77 were rejected. Claims 1-52 were previously canceled, and claims 53-59 were previously withdrawn. Claims 60, 67, and 73-77 have been amended herein. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 53-77 remain pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 60, 67, 73 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,981 to Papineni (hereinafter “Papineni”). Although Applicant does not agree with or acquiesce to the propriety of this rejection, claims 60, 67, 73, and 74 have been amended herein. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed Specification.

Amended claim 60 recites, in part, “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” and “adding the additional information to the inputted text with a change processing device so that the additional information is added before the beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text.” (Emphasis added). Although of different scope, amended claims 67, 73, and 74 recite similar features. Applicants submit that Papineni does not disclose each and every element of at least these claims.

Papineni is directed to a “system for conversant interaction” and a “dialog manager having task-oriented forms.” *See Papineni*, Abstract, col. 3, lines 8-9. Papineni further provides an interaction between the “conversant interaction” system and a human user, *see Papineni*, col. 15, but as indicated in the Advisory Action, the reference generates a “semantic representation” of the “broken down” input that is used to generate a “suitable response.” *See Advisory Action*, page 3. In response to an input of “I would like to transfer five thousand dollars,” the response is “confirming transfer of five thousand dollars from fidelity magellan to vanguard index trust fund five hundred. Please say yes or no.” *See Papineni*, col. 15, lines

59-61. As such, the system of Papineni has “broken down” the inputted text but does not disclose selecting “additional information related to the type of sentence” or adding “additional information . . . before the beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text,” as claimed. (Emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that independent claims 60, 67, 73, and 74 be allowed. Further, claims 61-66 and 68-72 depend from one of claims 60 and 67 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable features contained therein.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 60-64, 66-70, and 72-75

Claims 60-64, 66-70 and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 to Gabai (hereinafter “Gabai”) in view of Papineni. Although Applicant does not agree with or acquiesce to the propriety of this rejection, Claims 60, 67, 73, and 74 have been amended herein. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed Specification.

Amended claim 60 recites, in part, “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” and “adding the additional information to the inputted text with a change processing device so that the additional information is added before the beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text.” (Emphasis added). Although of different scope, amended claims 67, 73, and 74 recite similar features. Applicants submit that Gabai and Papineni, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of at least these claims.

Gabai is directed to an interactive toy that can read inputted text, translate it, and explain the cultural significance of the text. *See Gabai*, col. 43, lines 20-34. Although Gabai provides for “translating a menu” then explaining the “cultural significance of the dishes,” *see Gabai*, col. 43, lines 46-47, outputting a text translation is not the same as outputting inputted text. Further, the reference is silent with regard to “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” and “additional information is added before the

beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text.” (Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that Papineni fails to make up for such deficiencies.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

B. Claims 65 and 71

Claims 65 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gabai in view of Papineni and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,011 to Uwakubo (hereinafter “Uwakubo”). Claim 60 recites, in part, “selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence” and “adding the additional information to the inputted text with a change processing device so that the additional information is added before the beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text.”

(Emphasis added). Although of different scope, claim 67 recites similar features. As discussed previously, Gabai and Papineni, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest such features. Applicant submits that Uwakubo also fails to disclose or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

C. Claims 76 and 77

Claims 76 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Papineni in view of U.S. Patent No. 6385584 to McAllister et al. (hereinafter “McAllister”). Claim 76 recites, in part, “adding the additional information to the inputted text with a change processing device so that the additional information is added before the beginning of the inputted text or after the end of the inputted text.” (Emphasis added). As discussed previously, Papineni fails to disclose or suggest such features. Applicant respectfully submits that McAllister also fails to disclose or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 76 and 77 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 6/4/2011

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

Nikhil S. Palekar
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,279